

Cross-Cutting Issues

**Issue: Science, Technology and
Innovation/Research
(STIR)**

Science, Technology and Innovation (STI)

Indicator	STIR-1 Score on the Innovation Capacity Index among countries receiving USG assistance for science, technology and innovation programs.
Definition	The Innovation Capacity Index (ICI) is published in the annual report of the Innovation for Development Report, published by the European Business School. Each country is assigned an overall Index score, as well as scores for five component pillars. 2010-2011 scores ranged from 27.4 (Chad and Afghanistan) to 80.3 (Sweden). The ICI was developed to incorporate internationally comparable data, allowing for aggregation of foreign assistance program outcomes across multiple countries.
Primary Program Area (Program Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Primary Program Element (Program Sub-Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The Innovation Capacity Index is a proxy measurement for assessing the nation's capacity for innovation. Innovation capacity is a key factor in leveraging science and technology to improve quality of life and promote economic development.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Innovation Capacity Index ranges from 0 - 100.
Use of Indicator	The information generated by this indicator could be used for activity planning and evaluation at the operating unit level.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source for this indicator is The Innovation for Development Report (http://www.innovationfordevelopmentreport.org/ici.html). It is an annual indicator. The ICI covers 131 countries and identifies over 60 factors that are seen to have a bearing on a country's ability to create an environment that encourages innovation, such as a nation's institutional environment, human capital endowment, the presence of social inclusion, the regulatory and legal framework, the infrastructure for research and development, and the adoption and use of information and communication technologies, among others. Most variables used in the construction of the Index are "hard"—i.e., measuring directly some underlying factor, such as the budget deficit, expenditure in education, or cumbersome regulations, etc.—and, therefore, not dependent on a survey instrument. The universe of sampled countries has remained constant during the history of the Index.
Known Data Limitations	The index has five components: 1. Institutional environment

	2. Human capital, training and social inclusion 3. Regulatory and legal framework 4. Research and development 5. Adoption and use of information and communication technologies. Because the data sources used by the index come from secondary sources, lag times may exist with the collection of the original data and the use within the index. A country's annual rank may not accurately reflect the current capacity of a country.
Baseline Timeframe	The first Innovation for Development Report was published 2009 – 2010, and this timeframe should be used as the baseline.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	STIR-2 Number of tools, technologies, or practices introduced to the commercial sector
Definition	The indicator measures the number of inventions, tools, or ideas made available to the commercial sector in a country as a result of USG programs or interventions specifically focused on technology commercialization. “Tools and technologies” are broadly defined to include hardware and software across all disciplines (for example, a new form of micro-irrigation that could lead to greater water efficiency and higher crop yields, or improving the energy efficiency of a machine used in manufacturing). “Practices” are also broadly defined to encompass all types of innovation, ranging from management approaches, to processes and applications, to uses of tools and technologies. “Commercial sector” is defined as formal private sector businesses.
Primary Program Area (Program Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Primary Program Element (Program Sub-Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	As rates of incorporating new tools and technologies into private sector enterprises increase, they can act as drivers of economic growth and social improvements.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	The information generated by this indicator serves as a proxy for the contribution of USG science, technology and innovation assistance programs towards the commercialization of new technologies and innovations.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source is annual reporting by USG partners engaged in bringing tools, technologies and practices to the formal private sector. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	Tools, technologies and practices introduced to the private sector beyond the grant period will not be reported, as the USG-funded partner will no longer be engaged to report on the outcomes that occur in the longer-term. This indicator depends on timely and accurate reporting by the funded partner.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first six months of the activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	STIR-3 Number of new businesses established based on a new technology or innovation
Definition	The indicator measures the number of new business ventures established based on the use or application of a new technology or innovation. The scope of this indicator is USG programs and interventions that directly contribute to the establishment of a new business. A “business” is a formal micro-, small-, or medium-sized enterprise that has legal status as defined by the host country government. “Technologies or Innovations” are broadly defined to include hardware and software across all disciplines.
Primary Program Area (Program Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Primary Program Element (Program Sub-Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The establishment of new ventures, particularly small and medium-sized enterprises, is considered fundamental for economic development in developing countries. Private sector application and use of new technologies is one of the ultimate stages of USG investments in science, technology, and innovation.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	The information generated by this indicator will be used for tracking and accountability.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source is annual reporting from the USG funded partners working on creating new businesses. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	There may be subjectivity in identifying the particular tool or technology a new venture is based upon. Host country government legal and regulatory processes may make it difficult to assess if a business is formally established.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first six months of the activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex of primary business owner.

Indicator	STIR-4 Person hours of training completed in science and technology workforce supported by the USG
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Types of Training Counted: The indicator counts full- or part-time S&T education or training programs. S&T workforce training is defined as secondary or postsecondary courses and programs of at least one day (or 4 hours) that build individual capacity to promote economic development in the science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) sectors.
Primary Program Area (Program Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Primary Program Element (Program Sub-Element for IIP) Linkage	S&T Key Issue
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The indicator measures workforce development as it relates to the development and creation of skilled professionals in all STEM fields. This workforce is one key component of developing and leveraging science and technology innovation for societal benefit, including economic growth.
Indicator Type	Output

Unit of Measure	Number.
Use of Indicator	The information generated by this indicator will be used for tracking and accountability.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source is enrollment records maintained by implementers of USG-funded programs or activities. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	A STEM-based workforce is only one driver of innovation. This indicator does not measure other forms of human capital that are important for driving and utilizing innovation. This indicator will supply information about how many people are currently supported by USG assistance in a given year.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first six months of the activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex

**Research
(R)**

Indicator	STIR-5 Gross domestic expenditure on research and development (GERD) as percentage of gross domestic product (GDP) for beneficiary countries, as measured by UNESCO Institute for Statistics
Definition	The indicator measures gross domestic expenditure on research and development (GERD) as a percentage of GDP. Research and development (R&D) expenditure is the money spent on creative work undertaken on a systematic basis to increase the stock of knowledge and the use of this knowledge to devise new applications. This includes all expenditures on research performed by business enterprises, governments, universities and other institutions of higher learning, and not-for-profit research institutes irrespective of funding source. Funding from the USG as well as other sources supports progress on this outcome. This indicator normalizes overall R&D expenditure to a nation's GDP to demonstrate the contribution that scientific enterprise plays in the economy.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	R&D funding that is commensurate with economic growth and national income is necessary for ensuring sustainable development. The percentage of GDP invested in research and development is positively correlated with scientific output and the rate of GDP growth. USG research assistance aims to increase the role of R&D in economic growth. Increased expenditure on R&D by recipient nations indicates both an increased focus on utilizing science for country benefit and increased capacity to expand the scope and depth of R&D.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	The indicator could be used for planning, program adjustment, and budget decisions.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	UNESCO Institute for Statistics (http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?ReportId=2656) reports this information for developing countries every two years based on data collected from a UNESCO issued survey. Other organizations, including the OECD, collect and report the data from developed countries included in the UNESCO report.
Known Data Limitations	A lag time exists between the collection of data and the UNESCO report. Due to variation in the methods of data collection between countries, the indicator is likely best used as a measure of change over time within a single country. UNESCO is engaged in capacity building efforts to strengthen country participation and increase the scope and quality of collected data. Expenditure more directly measures R&D, rather than potential. Alternative measurements such as number of researchers per capita more directly measures potential, but data acquisition would be considerably more labor intensive and thus subject to greater possible inaccuracy.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline will be based on 2010 data.
Disaggregate(s)	

Indicator	STIR-6 Number of scientific studies published or conference presentations given as a result of USG assistance for research programs
Definition	The indicator defines “scientific studies” broadly to include all fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics. “Published” is defined broadly to include publication in such formats as peer reviewed journals and non-peer reviewed technical reports, including traditional paper or electronic formats. “Conference presentations” is defined widely to include formal presentations at workshops, meetings, and other gathering of professional within a specific discipline of study. USG assistance is defined to include grants or other awards of funding to support scientific studies, as defined above, where the purpose of the award is to directly support research and the distribution of the outcomes of this research – whether through publication or presentations – is a logical and expected outcome. “Research programs” is defined to include applied, development, or basic research. • “Applied research” is defined as a systematic study to gain knowledge or understanding necessary to determine the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met. • “Development research” is defined as the systematic application of knowledge or understanding, directed toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements. • “Basic research” is defined as the systematic study directed toward fuller knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of published scientific reports or conference presentations is a useful proxy to the state of science and technological development. High rates of publications and presentations suggest a healthy environment for science in which empirical data is presented, challenged, confirmed or rejected often leading to increased scientific enterprise output.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	This indicator could be used for program adjustments, budget decisions, and reporting and accountability.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source will come from results reporting documentation from implementers of USG-funded programs or activities. Reporting frequency will be annually. Publication records are additionally available through journal databases including Science Direct (www.sciencedirect.com), JSTOR (www.jstor.org), and PubMed (www.pubmed.com). These records are updated in real-time as new articles are published.
Known Data Limitations	The lag time between when research is conducted and findings are published or presented may make it difficult for implementing partners to capture results during the life of an activity, resulting in an under

	reporting of the actual number of papers or presentations that result from USG investments in research. This indicator may not differentiate between the same data published in multiple venues <i>versus</i> publications revealing new data. This may result in incorrect attribution of the impact of USG research funding on the reporting of results of research. The same applies to conference presentations to distinguish between multiple presentations about the same dataset.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first months of activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Applied, development, and basic research

Indicator	STIR-7 Number of new, USG-funded awards to institutions in support of research
Definition	The indicator defines “awards” broadly to include grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts that directly support research. If providing research grants is part of a larger award, then each sub grant is counted. “Institutions” are broadly defined to include private or public sector organizations that conduct research. “Research” is defined to include applied, development, or basic research. • “Applied research” is defined as a systematic study to gain knowledge or understanding necessary to determine the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met. • “Development research” is defined as the systematic application of knowledge or understanding, directed toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements. • “Basic research” is defined as the systematic study directed toward fuller knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The number of new awards provides some indication of the amount of research or research training taking place in a country. Awards are one measurement of the capacity of a country to conduct development research.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number
Use of Indicator	The indicator could be used for program adjustments, budget decisions, and reporting and accountability.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source will come from records of awards granted to implementing partners as well as reports of any sub-grants made by an implementing partner. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	Accurately categorizing the type of research funded may be difficult. This indicator depends on accurate and timely reporting by the grantee and does not consider non USG funding sources.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first months of activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Applied, development, and basic research

Indicator	STIR-8 Person hours of training completed in formal science or science-related training courses supported by the USG
Definition	This indicator uses the following equation to express the number of USG-supported training hours that were completed by training participants: Hours of USG supported training course x Number of people completing that training course Support from the USG: This indicator counts training hours that were delivered in full or in part as a result of USG assistance. This could include provision of funds to pay teachers, providing hosting facilities, or other key contributions necessary to ensure training was delivered. This indicator does not automatically count any course for which the USG helped develop the curriculum, but rather focuses on delivery of courses that was made possible through full or partial funding from the USG. People: Only people who complete the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Training: Training is defined as sessions in which participants are educated according to a defined curriculum and set learning objectives. Sessions that could be informative or educational, such as meetings, but do not have a defined curriculum or learning objectives are not counted as training. Types of Training Counted: Science or science-related training is defined broadly to include all science and technology, engineering, and math (STEM) programs. This indicator includes short-term (e.g., short-courses, in service trainings, and technical programs) and long-term (e.g. undergraduate or graduate programs that result in the participant receiving some kind of formal certificate or degree).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Building a STEM-educated workforce is a key step toward a sustainable research and development sector that can serve as a driving force for economic growth and improved quality of life. This can be accomplished by assisting beneficiaries in obtaining advanced degrees or enhancing their technical competencies through in-service technical training.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	The unit of measure the number of people participating in training or education programs.
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used for planning, program adjustments, budget decisions, and reporting and accountability.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source will come from enrolment records or scholarship reporting in results reporting documentation from implementers of USG-funded programs or activities. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	There may be delays in reporting completion of training course information, resulting in inaccuracies in reporting on participant numbers. Long-term programs may be difficult to attribute USG funding role.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first months of activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Sex Applied, Development, and Basic Research “Applied research” is defined as a systematic study to gain knowledge or understanding necessary to determine the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met.

	• “Development research” is defined as the systematic application of knowledge or understanding, directed toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements. • “Basic research” is defined as the systematic study directed toward fuller knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind.
--	---

Indicator	STIR-9 Number of new research collaborations established between USG-supported beneficiaries and other institutions
Definition	The indicator defines “research” to include applied, development, or basic research. • “Applied research” is defined as a systematic study to gain knowledge or understanding necessary to determine the means by which a recognized and specific need may be met. • “Development research” is defined as the systematic application of knowledge or understanding, directed toward the production of useful materials, devices, and systems or methods, including design, development, and improvement of prototypes and new processes to meet specific requirements. • “Basic research” is defined as the systematic study directed toward fuller knowledge or understanding of the fundamental aspects of phenomena and of observable facts without specific applications toward processes or products in mind. “Collaboration” is defined broadly to include formal research relationships, exchanges or partnerships (e.g., public-private partnerships), which may or may not be associated with funding. “Institutions” are broadly defined to include private or public sector organizations.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Building and increasing academic and scientific collaborations is a key step toward the exchange of information and ideas. This is particularly important in developing countries where collaborations among research programs in other countries may be limited. The establishment of new equitable collaborations among institutions can serve as a driving force for the exchange of information and ideas and building synergies and new research opportunities, while increasing in-country research capacity.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	The unit of measure is the number of collaborations
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used for program adjustments and budget decisions.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The data source will come from collaboration tracking records included in results reporting documentation from implementers of USG-funded programs or activities. Reporting frequency will be annually.
Known Data Limitations	It may be difficult to directly attribute USG resources role in the establishment of a collaborative effort. The informality or ephemerality of collaboration may make it difficult to track actual relationships. There is no method or standard to assess the sustainability of a particular collaboration.
Baseline Timeframe	Indicator baseline would be established by the operating unit within the first months of activity start-up.
Disaggregate(s)	Applied, development, and basic research

Issue: Capacity Building (CBLD)

Indicator	CBLD-1 Number of awards made directly to local organizations
Definition	This indicator counts the number of awards made directly by the USG (not through intermediaries) to local organizations each fiscal year. It excludes awards made to public sector institutions but can include awards made to parastatals or universities. Awards can be either acquisition or assistance. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a “local organization” must, • Be organized under the laws of the recipient country; • Have its principal place of business in the recipient country; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country. The term “controlled by” means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above, or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization’s managers or a majority of the organization’s governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law. “Foreign entity” means an organization that fails to meet any part of the “local organization” definition. Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization. For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria: • Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform; • Have its principal place of business in the region; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region. Regional platforms and bilateral missions also may include obligations or sub-obligations to international organizations composed principally of countries to which membership is limited to countries within the region,

	provided the funds are to be implemented directly by or through the regional international organization.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting an objective of USAID Forward's Implementing Procurement Reform (IPR) objective to diversify the USG's partner base. It is a direct measure of the increase in the number of USG local partners.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of awards to local organizations in the past fiscal year.
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the targets set under IPR Objective 2. It will be used by senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward's Objective 2 (LCD) of IPR and to plan for improvements in LCD programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from acquisition and assistance records kept in the operating unit.
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	2010 (each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2010)
Disaggregate(s)	For-profit organizations, Not-for-profit organizations

Indicator	CBLD-2 Percentage of operating unit program funds obligated through partner country systems
Definition	Operating units should enter the percentage in the results field and provide the numerator and denominator values where specified as disaggregates. The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator. Numerator: the dollar value of an operating unit's annual program allocation obligated (or sub-obligated via a bilateral agreement) through partner country systems during the fiscal year. The term "partner country system" is defined in ADS 220.1. Denominator: the total value of the current year program allocation for the Operating Unit. An operating unit's annual program allocation includes new obligating authority (NOA), carryover funds, and transfers from other US Government agencies. Missions that obligate funds into a SOAG/DOAG and sub-obligate funds into awards the year following the appropriation should treat these funds as if they were carry-over funds. For example, the full amount of funds obligated into a SOAG/DOAG in FY 11 should be included in the denominator for FY 12, and any funds that are sub-obligated through local systems should be counted in the numerator for FY 12. Partner country systems can be at the sovereign and sub-sovereign level. Funds obligated through regional governmental organizations are not included since these are defined as international organizations. An obligation is defined as a binding agreement that will result in an outlay (payment) either immediately or in the future. Budgetary resources (appropriations or other legal authorizations) must be available before obligations may be legally incurred. For out-year budget levels, please follow the latest CDCS guidance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting the stated target of USAID Forward's IPR Objective 1: "strengthen partner country capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability. It is a direct measure of the objective to: "increase obligations of program funds through partner country systems".
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the targets set under IPR objective 1. "Strengthen partner country capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability by increasing use of reliable partner country systems and institutions to provide support to partner countries." It will be used by senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward's Objective 1 of

	IPR and to plan for improvements in programming directly with public sector institutions.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from budget, acquisition and assistance records kept in the operating unit.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator is a proxy for improved capacity of financial management systems. Without appropriate controls and pro-active monitoring/capacity building efforts, increasing funds through partner country systems could in fact have the reverse of the intended effect. (Increasing funds to an institution not yet ready to manage those funds could make the institution vulnerable to corruption, mission-drift, etc.) Therefore it is essential that operating unit staff monitor implementation for unintended consequences.
Baseline Timeframe	2010 (each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2010)
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	CBLD-3 Percentage of operating unit program funds obligated to local organizations
Definition	Operating units should enter the percentage in the results field and provide the numerator and denominator values where specified as disaggregates. The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator. Numerator: the dollar value of operating unit program funds obligated or sub-obligated directly by the USG (not through intermediaries) to local organizations during the fiscal year. Denominator: the total value of the annual program allocation for the Operating Unit. An operating unit's annual program allocation includes new obligating authority (NOA), carryover funds, and transfers from other US Government agencies. Missions that obligate funds into a SOAG/DOAG and sub-obligate funds into awards the year following the appropriation should treat these funds as if they were carry-over funds. For example, the full amount of funds obligated into a SOAG/DOAG in FY 11 should be included in the denominator for FY 12, and any funds that are sub-obligated to local organizations should be counted in the numerator for FY 12. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a "local organization" must, • Be organized under the laws of the recipient country; • Have its principal place of business in the recipient country; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country. The term "controlled by", means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above, or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization's managers or a majority of the organization's governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law. "Foreign entity" means an organization that fails to meet any part of the "local organization" definition. Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization. For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria:

	• Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform; • Have its principal place of business in the region; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region. Regional platforms and bilateral missions also may include obligations or sub-obligations to international organizations composed principally of countries to which membership is limited to countries within the region, provided the funds are to be implemented directly by or through the regional international organization. An obligation is defined as a binding agreement that will result in an outlay (payment) either immediately or in the future. Budgetary resources (appropriations or other legal authorizations) must be available before obligations may be legally incurred. For out-year budget levels, please follow the latest CDCS guidance.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting the stated target of USAID Forward's IPR Objective 2: increase value of direct grants and contracts to local organizations. It is a proxy measure of the outcome of objective 2: Strengthen local civil society and private sector capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability. The assumption is that increased percentage of funds obligated to local organizations is directly correlated to higher capacity of these organizations because the USG can only give funds to organizations capable of managing those funds, thus an increased percentage in funds indicates higher capacity and organizations that have organizational weaknesses will be required to include capacity building targets in their activities as a requirement for ongoing receipt of funds.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the targets set under IPR Objective 2. It will be used by senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward's Local Capacity Development Objectives and to plan for improvements in LCD programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from budget and acquisition and assistance records kept in the operating unit.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator is a proxy for increased capacity. Without appropriate controls and pro-active monitoring/capacity building efforts, increased percentage of funds to local organizations could in fact have the reverse of the intended effect. (Increasing funds for an organization not yet ready to

	manage those funds could make the organization vulnerable to corruption, mission-drift, dependency on a single donor etc.) Therefore it is linked to other indicators that measure the quality of organizational capacity such as “Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners”
Baseline Timeframe	2010 (each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2010)
Disaggregate(s)	For-profit organizations, Not-for-profit organizations, Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	CBLD-4 Percent of mission awards with organizational capacity development objectives or activities that require reporting on capacity development metrics on a regular basis
Definition	Operating units should enter the percentage in the results field and provide the numerator and denominator values where specified as disaggregates. The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator. Numerator: the number of awards with capacity development activities that monitor and report on the impact of those activities on organizational development. The numerator should not include awards that involve only a few ad hoc trainings by the implementing partner, or only measure output (e.g., number of people trained) and not the impact on organizational performance of the local organizations. Denominator: the total number of awards currently active in the operating unit. This indicator tracks the percentage of awards with substantial capacity development activities. For the purposes of this indicator, “substantial” means that the implementing organization is required to report on progress towards strengthening capacity on a regular (at least annual) basis. The implementing partners can be local, US or international. They can be the recipients of any type of award.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks implementing partner capacity to implement and report on their organizational capacity development activities as well as the USG’s progress in including explicit capacity development indicators in awards/approved partner work plans/monitoring plans. The hypothesis is that the capacity of public, private for profit and not for profit organizations in recipient countries must be further developed in order to improve their financial management and their success in meeting the needs of their constituents. Direct funding will in turn increase local ownership and the effectiveness of foreign assistance.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the objectives of USAID Forward IPR capacity development objectives and will be used by senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by country-level managers to assess progress in achieving those objectives.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by AOTRs and COTRs from the capacity development metrics in implementing partner quarterly, semi-annual or annual reports.
Known Data Limitations	None – each operating unit will need to assess the quality of data reported by their implementing partners.
Baseline Timeframe	2010 (each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2010)
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	CBLD-5 Score, in percent, of combined key areas of organization capacity amongst USG direct and indirect local implementing partners
Definition	The reporting of the combined key area score will represent the capacity of local organizations measured across seven key capacity areas using the Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool. A copy of this tool can be found at the following link J:\Procurement Reform Objective Two\Organizational Capacity Assessment\OCA Overview.docx. The key capacity areas include: • Governance • Administration • Human Resources Management • Financial Management • Organizational Management • Program Management • Project Performance Management The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator. Numerator: the total number of points scored. Denominator: the total number of points possible, which may vary depending on the inclusion of optional OCA sections where relevant. (e.g. the sub-grant management section may or may not be relevant to the organization depending on program) Operating units should record score data for each organization in their performance management plan files so changes in scores for each organization can be monitored over time (it is not necessary to report each organization's score in the PPR). In addition, each operating unit must include in their performance management plan files: the assessment tool used, a description of the methodology employed for its implementation, and the data source identified as the basis for the rating of each factor. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a "local organization" must, • Be organized under the laws of the recipient country; • Have its principal place of business in the recipient country; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country. The term "controlled by", means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above, or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization's managers or a majority of the organization's governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of

	law. “Foreign entity” means an organization that fails to meet any part of the “local organization” definition. Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization. For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria: • Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform; • Have its principal place of business in the region; • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region. Both direct and indirect awardees should be included Regional platforms and bilateral missions also may include obligations or sub-obligations to international organizations composed principally of countries to which membership is limited to countries within the region, provided the funds are to be implemented directly by or through the regional international organization. Note: If an operating unit wishes to use an alternative assessment tool, for example one generated through the human and institutional capacity development (HICD) methodology or the IDF tool, it should at a minimum include the factors identified in the OCA.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator directly tracks an outcome of USAID Forward IPR Objective 2: to strengthen local civil society and private sector capacity.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress in actual local capacity development and will be used by management to report on progress towards achieving USAID Forward local capacity development objectives.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The assessment score sheet collected in the field by working directly with partner organizations to conduct annual organizational capacity assessments. Note: Specific data sources for each score for each factor in the assessment will be documented in the performance management files for each organization being assessed.
Known Data Limitations	While this is the indicator which most closely tracks actual organizational capacity, the variety of collection methods and possible tools present

	certain data quality issues. There is an issue of reliability. Within each operating unit reliability will depend upon rigorous implementation of a documented methodology for assessment. Across missions, it has been determined that flexibility to ensure that the assessment tool corresponds as directly as possible to the particular needs and context of each operating unit is more important than reliability. However to minimize differences across operating units one tool, the OCA is recommended. Records should be kept by each operating unit for each organization assessed and will be aggregated only for reporting purposes. Data is also subject to interpretation bias and there is a possibility that the assessment is intentionally manipulated for political or personal reasons. Therefore each operating unit must document how they determine what level of capacity has been attained across each of the factors assessed and include data sources that can be verified.
Baseline Timeframe	Baselines will vary across missions and organizations. The baseline year should be documented in mission records.
Disaggregate(s)	None

Indicator	CBLD-6: Percent of all contracts awarded for commodities and equipment that are fixed price
Definition	This indicator represents the percent of fixed-price contracts made directly by USAID (not through intermediaries) each fiscal year for commodities and equipment (including supplies). OUs should use indicator CBLD-7 to capture data on fixed-price contracts awarded for things other than commodities and equipment. Contracts include new (basic) task orders and purchase orders awarded during the fiscal year. The count is made against the year a contract was awarded or is planned for award. Therefore, each contract is only counted once. <u>Numerator</u>: Total number of new fixed-price contracts awarded by the OU for commodities and equipment in the fiscal year <u>Denominator</u>: Total number of all new contracts awarded by the OU in the fiscal year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting an objective of USAID Forward's Implementing Procurement Reform (IPR) objective 4 to reduce the Agency's reliance on "high-risk" contracts that are not cost effective. One way to achieve this is to increase the use of fixed-price contracts.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the targets set under IPR Objective 4. It will be used by USAID senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward's Objective 4 of IPR and to plan for improvements in fixed-price contracting understanding and programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from acquisition records kept in the operating unit.
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline data will be for new contracts awarded during fiscal year 2011. Each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2011. Contracts awarded prior to fiscal year 2011 must NOT be included in the baseline count.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	CBLD-7: Percent of all other types of contracts (i.e. services) awarded that are fixed-price
Definition	This indicator represents the percent of fixed-price contracts made directly by USAID (not through intermediaries) each fiscal year that are awarded for things other than commodities and equipment (i.e. services). OUs should use indicator CBLD-6 for fixed-price contracts for equipment and commodities. Contracts include new (basic) task orders and purchase orders awarded during the fiscal year. The count is made against the year a contract was awarded or is planned for award. Therefore, each contract is only counted once. <u>Numerator</u>: Total number of new fixed-price contracts awarded by the OU in the fiscal year for things other than commodities and equipment (i.e. services). <u>Denominator</u>: Total number of new contracts awarded by the OU in the fiscal year.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting an objective of USAID Forward's Implementing Procurement Reform (IPR) objective to reduce the Agency's reliance on "high-risk" contracts that are not cost effective. One way to achieve this is to increase the use of fixed-price contracts.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This indicator measures progress towards the targets set under IPR Objective 4. It will be used by USAID senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward's Objective 4 of IPR and to plan for improvements in fixed-price contracting understanding and programming.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from acquisition records kept in the operating unit.
Known Data Limitations	None
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline data will be for new contracts awarded during fiscal year 2011. Each operating unit will establish a baseline figure for fiscal year 2011. Contracts awarded prior to fiscal year 2011 must NOT be included in the baseline count.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Gender Equality/Women's Empowerment

Indicator	GNDR-1 Number of laws, policies, or procedures drafted, proposed or adopted to promote gender equality at the regional, national or local level
Definition	Any law, policy, or procedure designed to promote or strengthen gender equality at the regional, national or local level, which was developed or implemented with USG assistance. To be counted, the law, policy, or procedure should have as its objective or intent one or more of the following: reducing an aspect of social, economic, or political inequality between women and men, girls and boys; ensuring that women and men, girls and boys, have equal opportunities to benefit from and contribute to social, political, economic, and cultural development; to realize their human rights; or to have access to/control over resources necessary to survive and thrive; or preventing gender-related discrimination or compensating for past gender-related discrimination or historical disadvantage. A law, policy, or procedure may be designed to promote or strengthen gender equality at regional, national, sub-national, or community levels, and affect either formal or informal groups or institutions. Illustrative examples for this indicator include but are not limited to: • Laws—USG assistance for civil society to draft and advocate for passage of a law eliminating a barrier to women’s effective political participation. • Policies—USG support for adoption of a comprehensive policy on sexual harassment by the local police force. • Procedures—USG assistance for host government agency implementation of procedures for gender-sensitive survey design and data collection. Indicator narratives should include the name of the law, policy or procedure and should specify whether it was developed or implemented at the regional, national, sub-national, or community level (e.g. draft law on public financing for women political candidates developed by national civil society, municipal police force begins systematic implementation of existing policy to provide joint male-female patrols in critical areas, etc.). Items counted may include regulations, constitutional amendments or components, provisions to peace agreements, or other provisions designed to carry the force of law, official mandate, or authority. Numerator: Number (count) of relevant laws, policies, and procedures developed or implemented with USG assistance during the reporting period. Operating units may count a law, policy, or procedure only once in each stage of development or implementation; operating units may not report on the same law, policy, or procedure across multiple reporting periods unless it has advanced to the next stage (e.g. law drafted in one reporting

	period, law presented for legislative action in the next reporting period).
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the output of USG assistance that seeks to build the necessary or enabling conditions for the achievement of long-term, sustainable progress toward gender equality objectives across a wide range of sectors in which the USG provides assistance (e.g., reduced gender gaps in employment, income, political representation, or access to basic services).
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure/How to Measure	Unit of Measure: Relevant Item—individual law, policy, or procedure that meets criteria described in definition. How to measure it: Tally the number of relevant laws, policies, and procedures for the reporting period.
Use of Indicator	Information generated by this indicator will be used to track and report on output-level achievements linked to broader outcomes of gender equality/women's empowerment; information will be used for planning and reporting purposes by bureau-level and in-country program managers, and will support reporting to external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator will be collected on an ongoing or periodic basis depending on the interval of project/program reporting, but will represent a simple count of relevant items in the reporting period. The primary data for this indicator will be provided by implementing partners and collected through the COTR/AOTRs review of relevant project/program documents (e.g. quarterly and final reports, project monitoring records); however; other data sources such as analysis of secondary data (e.g. newspapers, legislative records) or direct observation by post may also be a source of data for this indicator, particularly if direct assistance is being provided to host country authorities or an entity to which standard reporting requirements may not apply.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator is an intermediate measure representing the number of laws, policies, or procedures developed or implemented with USG assistance, which are intended to promote gender equality and which are linked or presumed to be linked to the achievement of specific gender equality objectives. The indicator does not measure the quality of such laws, policies, or procedures, or the extent or quality of their implementation. The indicator does not measure outcome or impact-level progress against specific gender equality goals or objectives.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	The number of laws, policies, or procedures (or revisions to such) should be disaggregated by the following stages achieved with USG assistance: -law, policy, or procedure drafted/presented for public/stakeholder consultation; -law, policy, or procedure proposed/presented for legislative or other

	official action; law, policy or procedure passed/adopted; -law, policy, or procedure for which implementation has begun.
--	---

Indicator	GNDR-2 Proportion of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources (assets, credit, income or employment)
Definition	Productive economic resources include: assets - land, housing, businesses, livestock or financial assets such as savings; credit; wage or self-employment; and income. Programs include micro, small, and medium enterprise programs; workforce development programs that have job placement activities; programs that build assets (such as land redistribution or titling; housing titling; agricultural programs that provide assets such as livestock; programs designed to help adolescent females and young women set up savings accounts). This indicator does NOT track access to services – such as business development services or stand-alone employment training (e.g., that does not also include job placement following the training). Indicator narratives should specify type of assets. The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of females from program participants and Y is the total number of male and female participants in the programs illustrated above (e.g., micro, small, and medium enterprise programs; workforce development programs that have job placement activities; programs that build assets (land redistribution or titling; housing titling; agricultural programs that provide assets such as livestock).
	This is a new indicator but it builds on information collected for some of the standard (EG) output indicators that track the benefits of economic programs.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The lack of access to resources is frequently cited as a major impediment to gender equality and women's empowerment. Tracking the proportion of females among participants in USG funded interventions designed to increase access to economic resources can provide information on the scope of USG efforts to lift women out of poverty.
Indicator Type	Output
Use of Indicator	This indicator would be used to measure women's participation in USG-supported programs that provide access to economic opportunity.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data is to be collected by USAID implementing partners.
Known Data Limitations	The limitation of this indicator is that it does not track the quality of the program or actual increases or improvements in assets, income, or returns to an enterprise.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	By age: 10-29; and 30 and over; Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	GNDR-3 Proportion of females who report increased self-efficacy at the conclusion of USG supported training/programming
Definition	Self-efficacy is a widely used and frequently assessed psychological concept first developed by Albert Bandura in 1977. Fundamentally, feelings of self-efficacy refer to people's beliefs in their capacity to produce actions that are necessary for achieving desired outcomes/attainments. As a concept, it is similar to having a sense of personal agency. Self-efficacy has been shown to have a crucial impact on goal-setting, perseverance in the face of difficulties, and action-oriented behaviors. Feelings of self-efficacy can be assessed in specific contexts or as a more general, cross-situational belief that one has the capacity to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise general control over events in one's life. For the purposes of this indicator, only trainings of at least a full day duration or longer should be counted. Trainings or programs in any sector that have women's empowerment as a goal (even if not the only goal) should utilize this indicator. This would include programs/training in the following areas among others: leadership skills, youth development, civil society advocacy skills, conflict resolution or mediation skills, entrepreneurship, development of women's business associations or other forms of networking, etc. The unit of measure will be a proportion, expressed in the format of X/Y, where X is the number of women whose scores have improved over time and Y is the total number of women who participated in the relevant training/programming.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	One of USAID's key gender-related goals is to empower women. Although precise definitions of empowerment vary, they share in common an emphasis on women's agency and control over important life outcomes. Numerous USAID-funded programs seek to empower women; however, the end results of such empowerment may not be visible until USAID programming has ended. General feelings of self-efficacy can be presumed to mediate the relationship between efforts to empower women and their resulting actions and is more easily measurable within the time frame of a typical USAID activity.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Use of Indicator	This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of efforts to empower women through USAID programming across a wide variety of sectors. Trainings that do not result in improved feelings of self-efficacy may need to be adjusted.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator will be collected by survey, once at the start of relevant USG-funded training/programming and a second time at the end

	of the training/programming. The survey may be read to program beneficiaries who are illiterate. Each COTR or AOTR would be responsible for ensuring that implementers collect these data. The measure that will be used is the <u>Generalized Self-Efficacy or GSE</u> (Judge, Locke, Durham, & Kluger, 1998*), which includes the following items: • I am strong enough to overcome life's struggles. • At root, I am a weak person. (r) • I can handle the situations that life brings. • I usually feel that I am an unsuccessful person. (r) • I often feel that there is nothing that I can do well. (r) • I feel competent to deal effectively with the real world. • I often feel like a failure. (r) • I usually feel I can handle the typical problems that come up in life. Respondents will be asked to indicate the extent of their agreement with each item, using the following scale: -2 = Strongly Disagree -1 = Disagree 0 = Neither Agree nor Disagree +1 = Agree +2 = Strongly Agree <i>Items with an "r" are to be reverse-scored.</i> In other words, those items followed by an "r" that have a score of -2 should be recoded as a score of +2, -1 should be recoded as +1, +1 as -1 and +2 as -2. For example, for item 2 ("At root, I am a weak person), a response of 'strongly agree' would be re-coded as "- 2" and a response of 'strongly disagree' would be re-coded as "+2." Responses on each item should be added to yield a score between -16 and +16. A higher score indicates more positive feelings of self-efficacy. The proportion of participants whose score increased across time should be reported as a fraction with the number of trained participants overall provided as the denominator.
Known Data Limitations	This scale has been widely used in the psychology literature and has been shown to have good validity and reliability. Both the concept of general self-efficacy and scales designed to measure it (including the GSE) have been validated across scores of countries including Turkey, China, Japan, Iran, South Africa, Chile, Korea, Australia, and many others. Since the data will be collected by USG implementers, it should be free of manipulation.
Baseline Timeframe	The baseline should be set at the beginning of the program.

Disaggregate(s)	By age: 10-29; and 30 and over; Numerator, Denominator
*Judge, T. T., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C., & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluations. <u>Journal of Applied Psychology</u> , <u>83</u> , 17-34.	

Indicator	GNDR-4 Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social, economic, and political opportunities
Definition	This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of USG efforts to promote gender equality by measuring changes in target population attitudes about whether men and women should have equal opportunities in social, political, and economic spheres. Any program in any sector that has gender equality or women's empowerment as an objective should report against this indicator. This indicator will be particularly relevant to programs that seek to address or change social norms, especially those around gender. Illustrative programs include those designed to raise broad awareness of human rights, programs that train journalists to report more responsibly on gender issues, education programs designed to change social norms and gender roles, programs designed to increase the political participation of women, youth development and empowerment, or behavior change in the health sector, among others. The unit of measure is a proportion, expressed in the form of X/Y, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores on the equal opportunity survey have increased over time and the denominator is the total number of persons who participated in the relevant training/programming.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures changes in societal attitudes and norms about gender equality that may proxy for deeper structural changes in the social, political, and economic spheres.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Use of Indicator	The indicator will be used to measure the extent that USG supported gender equality and women's empowerment programs are changing attitudes. The information will be used for planning and reporting purposes by bureau-level and in-country program managers, and will support reporting to external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator will be collected by survey, once at the start of relevant USG-funded training/programming and a second time at the end of the training/programming. The survey may be read to program beneficiaries who are illiterate. Each COTR or AOTR would be responsible for ensuring that implementers collect these data. Respondents will be asked: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements? • Women should have equal rights with men and receive the same treatment as men do. - o Strongly Disagree

	- o Disagree - o Neither Agree nor Disagree - o Agree - o Strongly Agree • On the whole, men make better political leaders than women and should be elected rather than women. (r) - o Strongly Disagree - o Disagree - o Neither Agree nor Disagree - o Agree - o Strongly Agree • When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women. (r) - o Strongly Disagree - o Disagree - o Neither Agree nor Disagree - o Agree - o Strongly Agree To score the opportunity measure, responses are coded as follows: -2 = Strongly Disagree -1 = Disagree 0 = Neither Agree nor Disagree +1 = Agree +2 = Strongly Agree The items with an (r) should be reverse-scored. In other words, those items followed by an “r” that have a score of -2 should be recoded as a score of +2, -1 should be recoded as +1, +1 as -1 and +2 as -2. For example, for item 2 (“On the whole, men make better political leaders than women and should be elected rather than women”), a response of ‘strongly agree’ would be re-coded as “- 2” and a response of ‘strongly disagree’ would be re-coded as “+2.” Responses on each item should be added to yield a score between -3 and 3. A higher score indicates greater agreement that men and women should have equal opportunities. The proportion of participants whose score increased across time should be reported as a fraction, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores have increased across time and the denominator is the total number of participants in the relevant training/programming.
Known Data Limitations	These questions have been validated in the World Values Survey, and AfroBarometer in Africa and Ibero-American surveys in Latin America.
Baseline Timeframe	The baseline should be set at the beginning of the program.
Disaggregate(s)	Proportions to be disaggregated by sex; Numerator, Denominator

Gender Based Violence (GBV)

Indicator	GNDR-5 Number of laws, policies or procedures drafted, proposed, or adopted with USG assistance designed to improve prevention of or response to sexual and gender based violence at the regional, national or local level
Definition	Any law, policy, or procedure drafted, proposed, or adopted with USG assistance designed to improve prevention of and response to sexual and gender based violence promoted at the regional, national or local level. Gender-based violence (GBV) is an umbrella term for any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person's will, and that is based on socially ascribed (gender) differences between males and females. Forms of gender-based violence include, but are not limited to, domestic or intimate partner violence; rape as a weapon of war; sexual violence and abuse; female infanticide; psychological or emotional abuse; sexual harassment or violence in the workplace or in educational institutions; and harmful traditional practices including female genital mutilation/cutting, honor crimes, early marriage, forced marriage, bride kidnapping, and dowry-related violence. To be counted, the law, civil or penal code, policy, or procedure should address an aspect of the country's efforts to combat GBV, for example by spelling out individuals' rights to be free from violence in the public and/or private spheres; presenting a National Action Plan, strategy, or stand-alone law designed to address GBV; proposing or strengthening procedures to prevent, punish or eradicate gender-based violence; making provisions for new or increased services to victims of violence; proposing new legal remedies for addressing GBV such as the use of restraining orders or establishing new legal procedures that allow for the provision of services by NGOs. Numerator: Number (count) of relevant laws, policies, and procedures drafted, proposed or adopted with USG assistance during the reporting period. Denominator: N/A
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	This indicator measures the output of USG assistance that is designed to build the necessary or enabling conditions for reducing gender-based violence.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Unit of Measure: Relevant Item--individual law, policy, or procedure that meets criteria described in definition. How to measure it: Tally the number of relevant laws, policies, and procedures for the reporting period.
Use of Indicator	Information generated by this indicator will be used to track and report on

	output-level achievements linked to prevention of and response to gender-based violence, for planning and reporting purposes by bureau-level and in-country program managers, and will support reporting to external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator will be collected on an ongoing or periodic basis depending on the interval of project/program reporting, but will represent a simple count of relevant items in the reporting period. The primary data for this indicator will be provided by implementing partners and collected through the COTR/AOTRs review of relevant project/program documents (e.g. quarterly and final reports, project monitoring records); however, other data sources such as analysis of secondary data (e.g. newspapers, legislative records) or direct observation by post may also be a source of data for this indicator, particularly if direct assistance is being provided to host country authorities or an entity to which standard reporting requirements may not apply.
Known Data Limitations	This indicator is an intermediate measure representing the number of laws, policies, or procedures drafted, proposed, or adopted with USG assistance designed to promote prevention and response to gender-based violence. The indicator does not measure the quality of such laws, policies, or procedures, or the extent or quality of their implementation. The indicator does not measure outcome or impact-level progress against reduction of specific forms of GBV.
Baseline Timeframe	N/A
Disaggregate(s)	The number of laws, policies, or procedures (or revisions to such) should be disaggregated by the following stages achieved with USG assistance: law, policy, or procedure drafted/presented for public/stakeholder consultation; law, policy, or procedure proposed/presented for legislative or other official action; law, policy or procedure passed/adopted; law, policy, or procedure for which implementation has begun. Operating units may count a law, policy, or procedure <u>only once</u> in each stage of development or implementation; operating units may not report on the same law, policy, or procedure across multiple reporting periods unless it has advanced to the next stage (e.g. law drafted in one reporting period, law presented for legislative action in the next reporting period).

Indicator	GNDR-6 Number of people reached by a USG funded intervention providing GBV services (e.g., health, legal, psycho-social counseling, shelters, hotlines, other)
Definition	This indicator is a count of the individuals served by GBV services. Gender-based violence (GBV) is an umbrella term for any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person's will, and that is based on socially ascribed (gender) differences between males and females. Forms of gender-based violence include, but are not limited to, domestic or intimate partner violence; rape as a weapon of war; sexual violence and abuse; female infanticide; psychological or emotional abuse; sexual harassment or violence in the workplace or in educational institutions; and harmful traditional practices including female genital mutilation/cutting, honor crimes, early marriage, forced marriage, bride kidnapping, and dowry-related violence. Examples of type of service include: • Legal: Legal advice or accompaniment for survivors of GBV seeking protection or redress through the justice system; advice and assistance regarding divorce laws, restraining orders, remediation for property disputes, among others. • Health: Includes GBV screening, GBV referral programs that connect GBV survivors with appropriate psychosocial services, legal services, or economic support, and examination and treatment services for rape survivors. • Psycho-social counseling • Economic: Skills training or income-generation activities to help establish/re-establish livelihoods for survivors and their families. • Shelters: Activities to establish or rehabilitate centers where survivors of GBV can seek shelter, information, or services. • Hotlines <i>Individuals reached by mass media interventions are not counted in this indicator.</i>
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	Gender-based violence impacts both development and humanitarian assistance objectives and cuts across most technical sectors (e.g., health, education, democracy and governance, economic growth, and disaster response). This indicator indicates the types of services that are being delivered to male and female victims of abuse within and across countries.
Indicator Type	Output
Unit of Measure	Number of individuals who are provided with the intended intervention as defined in the program description and as prescribed in the intervention or service.
Use of Indicator	This indicator will enable headquarters to: • Gain a basic, but essential, understanding of the reach and scale of programs to address various types of services that are provided to

	male and female victims of abuse within and across countries. • Provide important, and possibly required, information to Congress and answer inquiries about GBV programming by Congress, external partners, the public, and international organizations. At the country level, this indicator will enable USG country teams, governments, implementing partners, and other in-country counterparts to: • Help assess whether interventions are adequately addressing identified needs within the country based on the country's baseline data on GBV, national strategy, and other information. • Identify programmatic gaps by analyzing the number and types of people (m/f, age group) being reached by services/interventions
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data to be collected and reported by implementing partners with programs in any sector (health, humanitarian, education, etc.) that are designed to raise awareness about or prevent gender-based violence.
Known Data Limitations	There are some limitations to this indicator. First, the indicator cannot provide information about the quality or intensity of GBV interventions or services. Second, because the indicator is a basic count without a denominator, and because distinctions between individual-, small group-, and community-level interventions are not being made: program coverage is difficult to estimate and comparisons across programs or countries will be difficult to interpret. Modifying the indicator to be percentage-based (i.e., adding a denominator to count the intended target population) would overcome this limitation. However, the denominator will differ according to the social and cultural contexts in which each program operates and therefore would be difficult to standardize across programs. Additionally, the indicator could be subject to double-counting (e.g., a beneficiary could be reached by both individual- and community-level interventions and counted twice) which could inflate estimates of the number of people reached.
Baseline Timeframe	To be established.
Disaggregate(s)	By Sex: Male, Female By Age: 10-29; 30 and over

Indicator	GNDR-7 Percentage of target population that views Gender-Based Violence (GBV) as less acceptable after participating in or being exposed to USG programming
Definition	This indicator is a proxy to measure the effectiveness of USAID programs designed to change social attitudes about GBV and reduce the numbers of men and women in a target population who believe that GBV is socially normal or acceptable behavior. Gender-based violence (GBV) is an umbrella term for any harmful act that is perpetrated against a person's will, and that is based on socially ascribed (gender) differences between males and females. Forms of gender-based violence include, but are not limited to, domestic or intimate partner violence; rape as a weapon of war; sexual violence and abuse; female infanticide; psychological or emotional abuse; sexual harassment or violence in the workplace or in educational institutions; and harmful traditional practices including female genital mutilation/cutting, honor crimes, early marriage, forced marriage, bride kidnapping, and dowry-related violence. The unit of measure is a proportion, expressed in the form of X/Y, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores on the "Attitudes Toward GBV Survey" have decreased and the denominator is the total number of persons who participated in the relevant training/programming.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The long term goal of USG work on gender-based violence is the prevention of GBV in all communities in which the USG works. Persuading both men and women, potential perpetrators, victims, and witnesses, that all forms of GBV should not be tolerated or viewed as acceptable is essential to this goal. This indicator will assist the agency in determining whether certain programming efforts are succeeding in changing attitudes among target populations.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Use of Indicator	This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of USAID efforts to reduce the numbers of males and females in a target population who view GBV as acceptable.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Data for this indicator will be collected by survey, once at the start of relevant USG-funded training/programming and a second time at the end of the training/programming. The survey may be read to program beneficiaries who are illiterate. Each COTR or AOTR would be responsible for ensuring that implementers collect these data. Respondents will be asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the following :

	Sometimes a husband is annoyed or angered by things that his wife does. How much do you agree that a husband is justified in hitting or beating his wife in the following situations? • She goes out without telling him. • She neglects the children. • She argues with him. • She refuses to have sex with him. • She burns the food. For each question, they will be asked to choose one of the following: • Strongly Disagree • Disagree • Neither Agree nor Disagree • Agree • Strongly Agree Responses are to be coded as follows: -2 = Strongly Disagree -1 = Disagree 0 = Neither Agree nor Disagree +1 = Agree +2 = Strongly Agree Responses on each item should be added to yield a score between -10 and +10. A lower score indicates greater agreement that GBV is unacceptable. The proportion of participants whose score decreased across time should be reported as a fraction, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores have decreased across time and the denominator is the total number of participants in the relevant training/programming. <i>Note: There are no validated indicators on the broad range of gender-based violence. Current practice is to use intimate-partner violence as a gauge of attitudes on gender-based violence</i>
Known Data Limitations	Questions about attitudes toward intimate partner violence have been validated in DHS surveys. Nonetheless, because answers are based on respondents' self-reported beliefs, the validity and integrity of the survey will be only as accurate as the respondent's answers, and whether or not they describe their true beliefs. Very likely there could be situations where respondents might be less than frank about their actual beliefs because they believe the survey taker would not approve. There should not be any issues regarding timeliness, since the surveys should be given right at the program outset and at its conclusion. There

	might be some difficulty, if a program does not work consistently with the same group of people over time. As noted in the footnote above, there are no validated measures about the acceptability of other types of gender-based violence.
Baseline Timeframe	The baseline should be set at the beginning of the program.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator; This indicator should be disaggregated by sex and by age: 10-29; and 30 and older.

Issue: Multilateral Contributions

International Organizations and Programs (IOP)

Indicator	MTLC-1 Percent of Major UN organizations funded by the IO&P account that have overall accountability ratings of at least 3 out of 5 on the United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative Phase II (UNTAI II) annual assessment
Definition	Using the UNTAI II results as reported in October for the previous Fiscal Year (i.e., October-September), calculate the percentage by dividing the numerator by the denominator where: Numerator = total number of UN organizations with an overall rating of ≥ 3 Denominator = total number of UN organizations rated The majority of funding from the IO&P account is contributed to major UN organizations, and this indicator reflects progress on important managerial aspects of those organizations as rated by the USG UNTAI II annual assessment. The annual assessment rates on 8 accountability goals based on the achievement of specific benchmarks using a 5-point scale. This overall score is an aggregate of the 8 individual goals. Read more about the eight accountability goals and about the UNTAI II assessment in general at http://io.p.state.sbu/MPR/UNTAI%20II/Forms/AllItems.aspx. Read more about its predecessor, the UN Transparency and Accountability Initiative Phase I (UNTAI) at http://io.p.state.sbu/MPR/UNTAI/Forms/AllItems.aspx.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	One long-term goal of USG voluntary contributions is to improve organizational and managerial performance of recipient multilateral organizations. This indicator measures the target organizations' efforts to improved overall organizational performance through enacted reforms to increase the accuracy of information; enhanced operational efficiency and effectiveness; bolstered capacity to uncover fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement; and increased methods that help to reduce or prevent conflicts of interest and misconduct.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	Results will be used by the Department to assess progress and to guide our engagement with UN organizations receiving U.S. funding. State/IO will brief UN organizations on the results of our assessments and periodically brief Congressional staff.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	Missions-conducted annual assessments for Phase I and will continue to do so for Phase II. The assessment forms, submitted every October, will rate the organizations against a number of benchmarks that would show progress towards strengthening accountability. All assessments are reviewed and validated by State/IO.
Known Data Limitations	No known limitations. Targets are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time-bound. Data collection guidance will be sent via cable to Missions prior to submission of assessment in October 2011 and annually thereafter. Two-stage review will be conducted by officers not involved in the collection or analysis of data. Written guidance will be

	sent to these reviewing officers.
Baseline Timeframe	Baseline will be established in late FY 2011 (September 2011)
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)

Indicator	MTLC-2 Percent of OSCE Performance Budget Performance Reports (PBPR) programs that include specific project/fund level indicators, baselines, and a measurement of progress
Definition	This indicator measures the degree to which OSCE project managers include specific indicators, baselines, and a measurement of progress as part of the project design and management process. Indicators should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-related (the OSCE uses the acronym “SMART” to describe these indicators.) To calculate the percent, divide the numerator (number of OSCE PBPR programs with SMART indicators) by the denominator (total number of PBPR programs)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The desired long-term impact is demonstrated integration of independent and internal evaluation functions within the OSCE project management. This objective furthers the vested interests of the 56 participating States in maximizing the effectiveness of the OSCE. The capacity of the OSCE to evaluate its programs and activities is an important component of promoting effectiveness. When done well, a fully-functioning evaluation process, both internal and independent, informs organizations about whether their programs and activities are producing intended results and provides a sound basis for decision-making in the program planning and budgeting processes. Effective evaluation processes also promote transparency and improved governance.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	The OSCE uses the Performance Based Program Budgeting (PBPB) approach to plan for, develop and manage its programs. The PBPB approach is essentially a form of results-based management which focuses the OSCE’s work, including projects, on achieving short-term results (outputs), and contributing to medium-term outcomes and long-term objectives. The Program Budget Performance Report is presented to participating States annually and constitutes the key program review document for the OSCE. The document serves to account for the use of previous year’s resources, as well as reports on the achievements and progress toward goals during the past year.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The OSCE provides data for this indicator directly to State (EUR) via annual reports, budget documents and additional project-related information. More information on OSCE is available at this website, http://www.osce.org/
Known Data Limitations	There are no known limitations to the data that we receive from the OSCE.
Baseline Timeframe	At this time, 10% of the funds include SMART indicators in their PBPR submission.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	MTLC-3 Percent of project and fund self-evaluations completed within 6 months of the end of the project with evaluation results submitted to the Office of Internal Oversight (OIO)
Definition	This indicator measures the degree to which OSCE project managers conduct close-out evaluations and present them in a timely fashion to the oversight office. While monitoring, controlling and evaluation take place throughout the OSCE project cycle, the final phase of the cycle is self-evaluation. This is the assessment of the completed project including its strategy, implementation and results by the department or unit of the OSCE executive structure that implemented it. Every project manager is responsible for carrying out self-evaluation on completion of the project, focusing on relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, sustainability, coherence, and added value. To calculate the percent, divide the numerator (number of OECD self-evaluations completed and submitted to OIO within 6 months) by the denominator (total number of self-evaluations completed and submitted to OIO)
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The desired long-term impact is demonstrated integration of independent and internal evaluation functions within the OSCE project management. This objective furthers the vested interests of the 56 participating States in maximizing the effectiveness of the OSCE. The capacity of the OSCE to evaluate its programs and activities is an important component of promoting effectiveness. When done well, a fully-functioning evaluation process, both internal and independent, informs organizations about whether their programs and activities are producing intended results and provides a sound basis for decision-making in the program planning and budgeting processes. Effective evaluation processes also promote transparency and improved governance.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Percent
Use of Indicator	This information is used to gain insight to OSCE's management and oversight capacity and thus inform participating States of OSCE's ability to effectively and efficiently carryout activities to which member States contribute financially.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The OSCE provides data for this indicator directly to State (EUR) via annual reports, budget documents and additional project-related information. More information on OSCE is available at this website, http://www.osce.org/
Known Data Limitations	There are no known limitations to the data that we receive from the OSCE.
Baseline Timeframe	Timely self-evaluation reports were completed and submitted for 25% of completed projects.
Disaggregate(s)	Numerator, Denominator

Indicator	MTLC-4 Number of OSCE projects and funds that are regularly evaluated by external organizations
Definition	This indicator measures the degree to which OSCE projects and funds are subjected to external evaluations. Risk assessment methods should be used to choose priority projects/funds for evaluation.
Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact	The desired long-term impact is demonstrated integration of independent and internal evaluation functions within the OSCE project management. This objective furthers the vested interests of the 56 participating States in maximizing the effectiveness of the OSCE. The capacity of the OSCE to evaluate its programs and activities is an important component of promoting effectiveness. When done well, a fully-functioning evaluation process, both internal and independent, informs organizations about whether their programs and activities are producing intended results and provides a sound basis for decision-making in the program planning and budgeting processes. Effective evaluation processes also promote transparency and improved governance.
Indicator Type	Outcome
Unit of Measure	Number/Count
Use of Indicator	This information is used to gain insight to OSCE's management and oversight capacity and thus inform member States of OSCE's ability to effectively and efficiently carryout activities to which member States financially contribute.
Data Source and Reporting Frequency	The OSCE provides data for this indicator directly to State (EUR) via annual reports, budget documents and additional project-related information. More information on OSCE is available at this website, http://www.osce.org/
Known Data Limitations	There are no known limitations to the data that we receive from the OSCE.
Baseline Timeframe	The External Auditor, in conjunction with its audit of the financial statements, in conducted five field visits to inform its annual report. The EA conducts one external audit per year highlighting programmatic/operational and management/administrative areas that require attention in its annual report.
Disaggregate(s)	